

numerous structural defects; it contains inferior quality equipment.

Our concerns specifically deal with Russia, because their involvement in this perilous project was highlighted by comments made by Russian officials visiting Havana earlier this year, just a few months ago, indicating Russia's intent in providing many lines of credit for the completion of the nuclear power plant.

Russia has already extended millions of dollars in credit for the maintenance of the plant, and they will continue to do so. So it is not fair that U.S. taxpayers' dollars should go to Russia, and then Russia turns around and builds a nuclear power plant in our backyard that could have very serious security and health concerns not only for the United States citizens but for Cuban citizens and Caribbean citizens as well.

It requires also that the President gives us an annual study of those countries that are aiding Fidel Castro in the termination of this very dangerous nuclear power plant.

Other elements of this law that will be before us tomorrow or the coming week are ones that require information that has not been forthcoming from the Clinton administration, specifically the State Department, in the enforcement of title IV of Helms-Burton.

Title IV is a part of our bill that requires the State Department to deny entry into the United States of those people, those companies or individuals who are violating laws because they have illegally confiscated U.S. property from U.S. citizens; and so we wrote that law to make sure that U.S. private property rights would be protected.

Unfortunately, the administration has not been forthcoming in giving us information about who are possible violators or who they believe have not been cooperating with our laws. The Clinton administration's enforcement of this section of Helms-Burton has been, to say the least, inadequate, as only a few companies have been sanctioned, despite overwhelming evidence that dozens of companies are, in fact, in violation of this U.S. law. These reports to the U.S. Congress in a periodic fashion will make it far easier for us to make sure that this enforcement process will be actually implemented, this important part of our Helms-Burton law.

Also, we have in this bill a provision that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has proposed, and we were proud to help him with it, and that has to do with detailed reports that Congress should get from the Clinton administration about Cuban refugees who have been returned to Cuba. We want to make sure that U.S. officials on the island helping those refugees are suffering no reprisals from the tyrannical Castro dictatorship.

A few years ago, the administration reached this immigration accord; and it promised to monitor the Cuban refugees who are returned to Cuba to make

sure that they are not mistreated by the Castro thugs. Unfortunately, little has really been heard about these monitoring activities; and our legislation is a way to assure that this important responsibility is performed by our officials in Cuba.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one last measure that I was proud to associate myself with and with our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), and that is to push for Israeli membership into the United Nations committee process, and that is also part of the H.R. 1757, which will be included tomorrow or next week.

□ 1515

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 17, I was absent for rollcall votes number 53, 54, and 55. Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative on all three.

#### ISSUES FACING CONGRESS AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a variety of issues today I would like to talk about.

First, I would like to talk about a major change that has occurred that probably will not make sense to a lot of viewers in America, but has a lot of meaning out here in Washington, D.C., because the Republican Party in the change that has taken place since 1995, was being severely tested during this past week.

We heard we were going to propose a supplemental spending bill. A supplemental spending bill means we are going to spend money that was not otherwise planned during our budgetary process, spend money on things like Bosnia that had not been budgeted for; the Iraqi problem that had not been budgeted for; things like the ice storm in the Northeast, and some of the other catastrophic happenings around, emergency spending type situations around the country.

They had decided they were going to spend money on these areas that had not been included in the budget. Since 1995, every time this kind of a proposal had been made, the Republicans have gone elsewhere in the budget process, found lesser important items, and offset the new spending by eliminating items that were of lesser import. But during this past week, for the first time since 1995, for the first time they started talking about just spending this new money, without going and eliminating spending elsewhere of lesser important items.

I am happy to be here today to say congratulations to the Republican

leadership and to my colleagues that encouraged them to make the decisions to find offsets for the spending in the supplemental spending bill. We are not just going to go out and spend and spend more of our children's money. When we spend this new money, we are going to go and find other programs that are less important to eliminate. We will not spend on these lesser important programs, so we will have the money available for the expenditures that, in all fairness, whether we agree or disagree with them, have already been made; things like the Bosnian situation, Iraq, and the catastrophic happenings around the country. Those items are going to be paid for.

The money in Bosnia, whether we agree or disagree, and I disagree with our troops being there, but the fact is our troops are there, for the money to pay for those troops we are going to find offsets, find lesser important items. We are going to eliminate those lesser important items so we can afford to spend in the new areas.

This is a monumental change from where we were a week ago. A week ago the money was just going to be spent. As of today, we are hearing our leadership promise us that we are going to find offsets, find lesser important things. That is a tremendous move forward. It should not go unknown or unnoticed by the people in this great Nation we live in when those sorts of changes are made.

The other very significant issue that is being discussed out here right now is called ISTEA. What that is is reauthorization of money to build roads and infrastructure all across America. We are hearing this proposal for ISTEA is spending more money on infrastructure than what people had anticipated in the past. It is more money than some budget hawks, myself included, might originally like to see.

I think we have to look at the whole package and understand that this money, too, that is being spent over and above what was originally laid out and projected, it is being offset from areas that are of lesser significance and of lesser importance than solid roads and infrastructure for this Nation.

I think to fully understand how this came about and what is happening here, we need to understand what has happened since 1995. When we got here in 1995, the budget deficit was \$200 billion, as far as the eye could see. Even after the tax increases of 1993 the projected budget deficits were significant, as far as the eye could see.

When we got here, we controlled Washington spending. We actually got the spending growth rate in Washington to be lower than the rate of inflation for the first time in eons. By controlling the growth of Washington spending, that meant that Washington did not go into the private sector and borrow that \$200 billion out of the private sector.

It is pretty simple from here. When Washington did not take that \$200 billion out of the private sector, that